

Attorney Docket No.: LSI.83US01 (03-1818)

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and further examination of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-18 were last presented for examination. Claims 19 and 20 have been added. Claims 1-20 are now presented for further examination.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 10, 14, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mori.

Mori discloses a system for determining the existence of a selected size and orientation of copy papers for use in a copying machine. The Mori system is useful for copying using various magnification ratios. Mori discloses orientation indicators and size indicators for the selected copy paper so that when installed copy papers do not satisfy the condition required by a desired mode of copying operation, it will be clearly indicated whether the size and/or the orientation of the installed copy papers are appropriate.

The Mori disclosure differs substantially from Applicant's claimed invention. For example, claim 1 recites "a method for detecting a page boundary in data stream." The term page boundary in this context refers to the manner in which a data stream is divided into groups of data called pages. Pages, in this case, do not refer to paper as disclosed in Mori. The preamble of claim 1 specifically recites that the page boundary relates to "a data stream." One skilled in the art would certainly recognize that the "page boundary" referred to in the preamble of claim 1 refers to the division of a data stream into pages or groups of data, and not to paper copies. Hence, the Mori disclosure is irrelevant to that which is claimed in claim 1.

Further, claim 1 recites "determining a page size." This step is also recognized by those skilled in the art as determining the amount of data that is to be included in a group or page in which the data stream is divided. There is no disclosure in Mori of such a step. Rather, the Examiner points to the step in Mori of determining size of a piece of paper. Mori determines the size and orientation of copy paper to make sure that the proper copy paper is selected that will fit the image to be copied. It is clear, that the step of "determining a page size" to those skilled in the art is not selecting the size of a piece of paper, but selecting a page size in a data stream.

Attorney Docket No.: LSI.83US01 (03-1818)

Similarly, the step of storing the page size is not performed by Mori. Also, the step of receiving a data stream address is not disclosed in Mori. The Examiner argues that the encoder A1 performs this function, but there is no disclosure of a data stream and an associated address as set forth in claim 1. Similarly, the step of performing a Boolean logic operation on the data stream address and the page size, comparing the binary output and causing the boundary signal to change state are also not performed by Mori. For these reasons, the rejection of claim 1 as being anticipated by Mori should be withdrawn.

Claim 10 has similar limitations as claim 1 and is considered to be patentable for the same reasons. Claims 4, 5, 8, 14, 16 and 17 are all considered to be patentable for the same reasons as recited with respect to claim 1.

In addition, claims 19 and 20 are considered to be allowable for the same reasons as claims 1 and 10, as set forth above. Claims 19 and 20 further define the manner in which a page size is selected and the manner in which the address of the data stream relates to the data in the data stream.

Claims 2, 3, 5-7 and 11-13 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori in view of Mano. The Examiner argued that Mano discloses an XOR, with equivalent circuits having other logic operators such as AND, NAND, OR and NOR. The Examiner argues that it would be obvious to implement the various other logic gates such as AND, NAND, OR and NOR in view of the teachings of Mano.

Mano does not make up for the deficiencies of Mori. There is no disclosure in Mano or Mori of "a method of detecting a page boundary in a data stream" as would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. Further, it appears unlikely that a substitution of other logic gates in Mano would allow Mano to operate as intended. For the reasons set forth above, claims 2, 3, 5-7 and 11-13 are considered to be patentable over the combination of Mori and Mano.

Claims 9 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori. The Examiner argued that Mori does not specifically disclose the circuit as part of an integrated circuit and that it is well known in the art that logic gates and memories can be implemented on an integrated circuit.

Claims 9 and 18 are considered to be allowable for all the same reasons as claims 1 and 10.

Attorney Docket No.: LSI.83US01 (03-1818)

For these reasons, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Dated this 8<sup>th</sup> of September, 2005.

COCHRAN FREUND & YOUNG LLC

By: 

William W. Cochran  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant  
2026 Caribou Drive, Suite 201  
Fort Collins, CO 80525  
(970) 492-1100  
Fax: (970) 492-1101

#26,652